



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the mystic influence of visions and dreams—this is the religious method. But in another generation or in another century it changes, and a rigid severity of life and thought becomes supreme. The key-notes of life are rectitude and truth, a living up to certain standards, even at the cost of happiness and life. Religion has among its votaries both classes. Religion stands in need of both classes; and if for a while one influence gains supremacy, a little later the other will rise to counterbalance and counteract. That these two types of religious life and character may live and work together is proved beyond all question by the scriptural testimony given in the work of Amos and Hosea. Is there a great lesson for all modern times in this close juxtaposition of two widely contrasted temperaments?

LIBERTY OF TEACHING IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

As was stated in the January number of the *Biblical World*, the trustees of Union Theological Seminary have recently voted that the professors in that institution shall not be compelled to express conformity with the Westminster Confession. The charter of the institution is one of the broadest possible in a theological seminary connected with the denomination. The recent action of the trustees was simply a return to the provisions of this charter which lays no denominational test whatsoever upon the teachers of the institution, but provides in effect that the theological instruction shall be equal to the best given in the country, and that particular attention shall be given to the teaching and discipline of the Presbyterian church.

The significance of the action of the trustees is considerable. It marks the general tendency of leading theological seminaries to grant to their faculties increased liberty in teaching. This tendency, it must be confessed, carries with it in America certain difficulties. However desirable a different condition of affairs might be, the religious life of America at present is, and for a good many years to come will be, denominational. Theological seminaries were originally established for the purpose of training men for serving a particular denomination. In the case of four or five such seminaries, and among them Union, this original purpose has been so far modified that their student body is to all intents and purposes inter-

denominational; and further, in the case of two or three seminaries the teaching body is also composed of men of different denominations. Yet these are clearly exceptional circumstances, and, as a rule, the relation of the seminaries to the churches is still that of earlier times. The churches look to the seminaries to train men in their own characteristic doctrines.

This attitude of the churches must be taken into account in discussing freedom of teaching in theological schools. There is no evangelical seminary today, Union not excepted, which would permit a professedly Unitarian professor to remain upon its faculty. Liberty of teaching in such institutions is not the liberty of the university, but of the medical school.

It follows inevitably that, as conditions are today, until theology becomes in America as in Germany a university discipline, liberty of teaching must be accompanied by the education of a denominational constituency. However theoretically desirable it might be to allow a teacher in a denominational theological school to teach whatever he believes to be true, practically there are limits set by the degree of liberality that marks the denomination which the seminary represents. In the same proportion, therefore, as the denomination recognizes the principle of academic liberty does it share in the new dignity given theology. Any action looking to the recognition of such liberty is a splendid tribute to a denomination. And, what is more, it is a splendid promise for that denomination's future. What may we not expect of a church which, loyal to its own past, has also sufficient confidence in its seminary and in truth to guarantee its teachers the utmost liberty in investigation and teaching! The action of the trustees of Union, as well as of several other institutions, is the best indication of the permanence of denominations. The increased liberty in teaching will not be found to destroy existing religious institutions, but will make them more forceful and effective for meeting the peculiar demands of a diversified people.